Studies in Sāṃkhya (I)
Author(s): J. A. B. van Buitenen
Source: *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 76, No. 3 (Jul. - Sep., 1956), pp. 153-157
Published by: American Oriental Society
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/596286
Accessed: 10/09/2010 15:39

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=aos.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

American Oriental Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the American Oriental Society.*

http://www.jstor.org

STUDIES IN SĀṂKHYA (I)

J. A. B. van Buitenen
Deccan College

AN OLD TEXT RECONSTITUTED

The importance of the text-group MBh. (Cr. Ed.) 12, 187; 239-40 = (B) 12, 194; 247-48; 285 = (C) 12, 7066-7128; 8974-9023; 10485-10531 for the early history of Sāṃkhya has long been recognized. Frauwallner in his recent *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie* even describes this text-group as the basic form of Sāṃkhya found in the epic (epische Grundform), constituting the first stage in the formation of Sāṃkhya, still ignorant of the evolution process which is characteristic of the second stage and thenceforth of all Sāṃkhya.[1] Johnston in his monograph *Early Sāṃkhya* attaches great importance to the theory of the *bhāvas* as he finds it in our text and holds that this *bhāva* is probably the oldest name for *guṇa* in the sense of the well-known triad *sattva, rajas and tamas,* and that their function of "psychical, moral qualities" which they have in our text is the original function of the three guṇas.[2] I believe that both Frauwallner and Johnston are wrong and that the very text on which they rest their cases proves them wrong.

It is evident that the two texts of the Critical Edition[3] and the three texts of the Bombay and Calcutta Editions are versions of one text. Belvalkar, the discriminating editor of the Śāntiparvan, has eliminated the third version: it finds its right place in the critical apparatus of 12,187. The second version has rightly been preserved, although the basic MS. $Ś_1$ omits it.

[1] Erich Frauwallner, *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie,* 1. Band (Salzburg, 1953), Chapter 6, pp. 289 ff., esp. 299 ff.

[2] E. H. Johnston, *Early Sāṃkhya* (R. A. S. Prize Publication Fund Vol. XV, London, 1937), pp. 31 ff., esp. 34.

[3] The edition of the text of the Śāntiparvan, including Mokṣadharma (Fasc. 22-24, with Appendices and Critical Notes; Poona, 1951-53), is complete, except for the important introduction to the whole parvan, which is in the press.

When we read through the two versions we are struck by the fact that the term *bhāva* occurs in two altogether different situations: first in connection with such "sensations, qualities and conditions" as *sukha/prīti, duḥkha/śoka, moha*; *praharṣa* etc., *atuṣṭi* etc., *aviveka* etc.; secondly in connection with a process by which the buddhi modifies itself into manas as its *bhāva,* as in 187, 24ab *atibhāvagatā buddhir bhāve manasi vartate,* 240, 1ab *mano prasṛjate bhāvaṃ buddhir adhyavasāyinī,* and ib. 3ab *yadā vikurute bhāvaṃ tadā bhavati sā manaḥ.* It is clear that we have here two different functions of the term *bhāva.*

We shall isolate the first set of *bhāvas* which is more easily recognizable. Our starting-point is an identical series found in a text which, though no doubt hailing from the same milieu of thinkers, cannot be regarded as still another version of our one text but forms a separate text in its own right: 12, 212 (B. 219) entitled *Pañcaśikhavākya.* We note the following literal agreement in the description of *bhāva* I: 187, (28a)[4]. 30-35 = (240, 1d). 239, 20-25 = 212, (25c).26-31. There is no need to assume interpolation from one text into the other, but we simply conclude that this description of *bhāva* I in 6-7 ślokas was current in a certain milieu in a certain period. Starting from this description we connect all the occurrences of *bhāva/guṇa* where its function is evidently either identical or similar to the *bhāva* of the description. So we connect 187, 21cd-22ab; 25cd; 27; 29; 240, 7; 14.

When we have isolated the passages where *bhāva/guṇa* figures as "sensation, quality or condition," we are left with an odd assortment of stanzas and half-stanzas which have one thing in common: *bhāva* occurs in a function which cannot NATURALLY and EVIDENTLY be connected with *bhāva* I:

[4] The stanzas enclosed in parentheses have *trividhā vedanā* in common: also in my opinion 240, 1d *trividhā karma codanā* (cf. Cr. Ed. App.).

187 *puruṣādhiṣṭhitā buddhir triṣu bhāveṣu vartate* / 21 ab
evaṃ naraṇāṃ manasi triṣu bhāveṣv avasthitā / 22 cd
seyaṃ bhāvātmikā bhāvāṃs trīn etān nātivartate /
saritāṃ sāgaro bhartā mahāvelām ivormimān // 23
atibhāvagatā buddhir bhāve manasi vartate /
pravartamānaṃ hi rajas tad bhāvam anuvartate // 24
indriyāṇi hi sarvāṇi pradarśayati sā sadā / 25 ab
ye ye ca bhāvā loke 'smin sarveṣv eteṣu te triṣu /
iti buddhigatiḥ sarvā vyākhyātā tava bhārata // 26

240 *mano prasṛjate bhāvaṃ buddhir adhyavasāyini* / 1 ab
yadā vikurute bhāvaṃ tadā bhavati sā manaḥ / 3 ab
indriyāṇāṃ pṛthagbhāvād buddhir vikriyate hy aṇu / 4 ab
tiṣṭhatī puruṣe buddhis triṣu bhāveṣu vartate / 6 cd
seyaṃ bhāvātmikā bhāvāṃs trīn etān ativartate /
saritāṃ sāgaro bhartā mahāvelām ivormimān // 8
avibhāgagatā buddhir bhāve manasi vartate /
pravartamānaṃ tu rajah sattvam apy anuvartate // 10
ye caiva bhāvā vartante sarva eṣv eva te triṣu /
anvarthāḥ saṃpravartante rathanemim arā iva // 14

Now our collection of odd ślokas shows a positive coherence: there is a striking predilection for the root *vṛt* and derivates; an evident preoccupation with creation and modification: *vi-kṛ*; *pra-sṛj*; a series *puruṣa* — *buddhi* — *manas* — *indriyas*; two similes suggestive of cosmology (sea and its waves and current; wheel with three spokes). These points persuade us that our lines have to do with an evolution theory. We read: the *buddhi*, in or under the *puruṣa*, exists actively (*vartate*) in three *bhāvas*; she is like the ocean in that she does, or does not, transcend its *bhāvas*, as the ocean its waves and current; the *buddhi*, beyond *bhāvas* or undivided as it is, exists in a *bhāva manas*; *manas* is a *vikāra* of the *buddhi*: it becomes *manas*; *rajas* somehow getting active succeeds that *bhāva*, or that *sattvam*; then the *buddhi* enters into some relation with the senses—the text is obscure—but it is clear that it evolves again out of the *bhāva* of every separate sense; all *bhāvas* in the world are somehow comprised under these three, which together roll on along with their objects like the spokes along with the felly.

As far as possible we have followed the order of our texts in this description. A few points have to be settled.

1. 187 *nātivartate* // 240 *ativartate*. Starting from the simile, does or does not the ocean transcend the waves in which it consists (*ūrmimān* // *bhāvātmikā*) and the incoming current of the rivers? It does: it is the *lord* of the rivers. Besides, it is impossible not to think of the frequent application of the same simile to the transcendent creator who is modified in the *prapañca* as the ocean is modified in its waves, yet transcends the *prapañca* as the ocean transcends its waves which disturb only its surface.[5] Finally, *nātivartate* contradicts *atibhāvagatā* / *avibhāgagatā*, which both convey the transcendence of the *buddhi*.[6] We will therefore prefer the reading *ativartate*.

2. 187 *atibhāvagatā* // 240 *avibhāgagatā*; both contrast no doubt intentionally with *bhāve manasi vartate*: 'the *buddhi*, originally beyond the *bhāvas* or not yet divided (*vibhāga* ∽ *vikāra*: 'not yet evolved'), comes to exist in the *manas* as its *bhāva*.' Neither reading is distinctly preferable to the other.

3. 187, 25: neither the first *hi*,[7] nor *pradarśayati*, nor *sadā* are contextually significant. The fact that *rajas* gets active and succeeds the aforesaid (*tad*) *bhāva* offers no explication (*hi*) for the fact that the *buddhi* first exists in the manas as its bhāva. *tu* 'Germ. *aber*' is preferable. *pradarśayati* . . *sadā* is not quite nonsense: 'the *buddhi* makes

[5] Bhavabhūti, *Uttararāmacarita* III, 48; Śankara, BrSBh. 2, 1, 13; Bhāskara, BrSBh. passim; Yāmuna, *Saṃvitsiddhi* (in: Siddhitraya, Chaukhamba Skt. Ser. 10; Benares, 1900), p. 82, st. beginning *jñānādi*, and next one, is closest to the pre-classical Sāṃkhya view of the Puruṣa manifested in his *vibhūti*, a *prakṛti* likened to the ocean.

[6] Cf. Belvalkar's critical note (ad 187, 24, p. 2160): "the v. l. of *atibhāvagatā* . . all denote the transphenomenal state of the Buddhi, when it is not occupied with anything in particular."

[7] Unless it be taken as an "expletive particle, marking off successive stages.

the senses always visible,' which conveys some sort of manifestation; but when we find a very well attested variant *pravartayati* .. *tadā* 'the *buddhi* then starts the senses on their career, brings them about, sets them in motion,' the choice is not difficult; besides, we have another derivative of the favorite root *vṛt*.

When we now arrange both versions according to the above description, which presented itself naturally, we obtain a text: 187, 21 ab (∽240, 6 cd) — 23 (∽8) — 24 (∽10) — 25 a (corrected) — 240, 4 b — 187, 26 ab (∽240, 11 ab) — 240, 11 cd — 187, 26 cd. We have kept to the order in both texts, with one exception: 240, 4 ab. We have not accounted for 240, 3 ab (*yadā vikurute bhāvaṃ tadā bhavati sā manaḥ*) which certainly belongs to our text, and which cannot better be fitted than between 187, 24 ab and cd (240, 10 ab and cd); but since these two half-ślokas are coupled together in both versions and should not be split up arbitrarily, we are inclined to consider 240, 3 ab an additional explication of WHY the *buddhi* exists in the *manas* as its *bhāva*. This view gains in plausibility when we see that there are not less than two doublets of this half śloka: 240 1 ab and 9 ab; marginal ślokas arbitrarily incorporated in a series of conflated copies? 240, 4 b belongs much more intimately to our text: it explains a stage nowhere else explained: 1. *manas*; 2. senses; 3. evolution out of the senses. We notice that the other ślokas followed one another closely with only an incidental interruption, 290, 406; we wonder if the portion between 240 4 ab and 6 ab belong to our text. Evidently: they describe how the *buddhi* becomes the senses. This portion corresponds to 187, 18-19 ab, which however differs considerably; still both portions are to be found in corresponding situations. 187. 20 has one more śloka where we find the objects of the senses mentioned; this śloka is split up in 240: 187 , 20 cd ∽ 240, 5 ab; id. 20, ab ∽ id. 9 ab; this split in itself is proof of the coherence of the two portions before and after 187, 21 ∽ 240, 6.

After these complicated considerations we are able to constitute the following text:

puruṣādhiṣṭhitā buddhis triṣu bhāveṣu vartate /	A 21 ab; B 6 cd
seyaṃ bhāvātmikā bhāvāṃs trīn etān ativartate // **1**	A 23 ab; B 8 ab
saritāṃ sāgaro bhartā mahāvelām ivormimān /	A 23cd; B 8 cd
atibhāvagatā buddhir bhāve manasi vartate // **2**	A 24 ab; B 10 ab
**yadā vikurute bhāvaṃ tadā bhavati sā manaḥ*	B 3 ab
pravartamānaṃ tu rajas tad bhāvam anuvartate /	A 24 cd; B 10 cd
indriyāṇi hi sarvāṇi pravartayati sā tadā // **3**	A 25 ab
śṛṇvatī bhavati śrotraṃ spṛśatī sparśa ucyate /	B 4 cd ∽ A 18 ab
paśyatī bhavati dṛṣṭī rasatī rasanaṃ bhavet // **4**	B 5 ab ∽ A 18 cd
jighratī bhavati ghrāṇaṃ buddhir vikriyate pṛthak /	B 5 cd ∽ A 19 ab
indriyāṇīti tāny āhus teṣv adṛśyādhitiṣṭhati // **5**	B 6 ab ∽ A 20 cd
adhiṣṭhānāni buddher hi pṛthagarthāni pañcadhā /	A 20 ab ∽ B 9 ab
indriyāṇāṃ pṛthag bhāvād buddhir vikurute hy aṇu // **6**	B 4 ab
ye caiva bhāvā vartante sarva eṣv eva te triṣu /	B 14 ab; A 26 ab
anvarthāḥ saṃpravartante rathanemim arā iva // **7**	B 14 cd
† *iti buddhigatiḥ sarvā vyākhyātā tava bhārata //*	A 26 cd

(A = 12, 187; B = 12, 240)

1a B *tiṣṭhatī puruṣe* (cf. Cr. Ed. app. on A)—**1d** A *nāti-* — A adds (22 cd) *evaṃ narāṇāṃ manasi triṣu bhāveṣv avasthitā*: doublet of A1 to fill up the śloka after the interruption 21 cd–22 ab — **2c** B *avibhāgagatā* — * possibly additional (marginal?) śloka explaining 2d; doublets *manaḥ prasṛjate bhāvaṃ buddhir adhyavasāyinī* (240, 1 ab) and *yadā prārthayate* (<*prasṛjate?*) *kiṃcit tadā bhavati sā manaḥ* (ib. 9 ab) — **3a** A *hi* (cf. Cr. Ed. app. on A) — **3b** B *sattvam apy* for *tad bhāvam*; *sattvam* "attracted" by *rajas? apy* looks like a stop-gap; on *rajas* alone see discussion below — **3d** A *pradarśayati sā sadā* (cf. Cr. Ed. app. on A); B om. **3cd—4-5** acc. to B; A shows traces of B but seems to have been mixed up with a similar series of definitions of senses and names. — **4c** Belvalkar marks *paśyantī* doubtful; Belvalkar marks *bhavate* doubtful — **4d** Belvalkar marks *rasatī* doubtful; id. **5a** *jighratī* — **5cd** A *pañcendriyāṇi yāny āhus tāni* (Belvalkar: doubtful) *adṛśyo 'dhitiṣṭhati* — **6ab** B *adhiṣṭhānāni vai buddhyā* (Belvalkar: doubtful) *pṛthagetāni saṃsmaret*; sequence **5cd-6ab** uncertain but plausible; A om. **6cd**; **6d** B *vikriyate* (cf. Cr. Ed. app. on B); Belvalkar: *aṇu* doubtful — **7a** śloka acc. to B; **7ab** A reads *ye ye ca bhāvā loke 'smin sarveṣv eteṣu te triṣu* — A om. **7cd** — † acc. to A; B om.; no doubt a secondary śloka whereby whole episode is fitted into the "Mahābhārata."

*
* *

TRANSLATION. "1 The *buddhi* controlled by the *puruṣa* exists in three evolved forms of being; characterized as it is by these three forms it goes beyond them, **2** just as the billowy ocean, lord of the rivers, goes beyond the waves of the current. Though really beyond any (evolved) form of being, the *buddhi* comes to exist in the form of being *manas*: * when the *buddhi* modifies its form of being then it becomes the *manas*.* **3** Then however *rajas* gets active and succeeds that form of being: for it is then that the *buddhi* brings about all five senses. **4** Hearing it becomes ear; touching it is called (organ of) touch; looking it becomes eyes; tasting it become tongue; **5** smelling it becomes nose: thus the *buddhi* is successively evolved. These (organs) are called senses; the *buddhi* rules in them invisibly. **6** Now these instruments of the *buddhi* have each their own object, five in total: out of each form of being of the senses separately the *buddhi* evolves (the corresponding elemental) atom. **7** All forms of being (things) that exist are comprised under these three forms of being: they unroll themselves each according to its purpose or end, like the spokes roll along with the felly of the cartwheel.

† Thus, O Bhārata, is explained to you the entire course of the *buddhi*."

* * *

It should not be necessary to stress that this compact little text with its strong inner coherence is not a purely hypothetical construction, but simply a text legitimately restored on the basis of two incomplete and corrupt versions—comparable to two badly damaged manuscripts—which between them have preserved almost the entire text. It started probably when one palm-leaf, containing on one side st. 1-3 and on the other st. 4-7, was turned upside down and the copyist did not notice. From then on the text was not longer understood and it disintegrated. A short time after the leaf had been copied wrong side up and before disintegration set in, a parallel version came into existence: this explains why 240 has preserved some original readings. It follows that $Ś_1$, though it follows the older text tradition without parallel, has not more authority than the parallel version 240. Probably only B had the explanatory line (*). Our text is probably incomplete, as might be expected: we miss a śloka enumerating the elements. That *aṇu* does indeed stand for "subtle element" is not impossible but not at all likely; still Belvalkar was well advised to accept *aṇu* as the *lectio difficilior*.

I consider this little text very important. It definitely gives the lie to a primitive "Sāṃkhya" without evolution, as Frauwallner construes. There is no mistaking the evolutionary function of *rajas*. Johnston's view that the *guṇas* were originally "moral or psychical qualities of the *buddhi*" is rejected.

The solitary function of *rajas* is curious but not without parallel. MBh. (Cr. Ed.) 12, 206 (B 12, 213), 9 cd reads: *rajasy antarhitā mūrtir indriyāṇāṃ sanātanī* "the eternal embodiment of the senses is hidden in *rajas*," and 20 cd *indriyāṇāṃ rajasy eva prabhavapralayāv ubhau* "in the *rajas* alone the senses have both their beginning and their end." It is noteworthy that such a function in the process of evolution is here too only ascribed to *rajas*; *sattva* and *tamas* do not figure. We shall have to deal with these passages in greater detail in a study of the *ahaṃkāra*.

There is more epic evidence of *bhāva* [8] in the above sense of "form of being, cosmic phase evolved under the influence of a *guṇa*." Suggestive is 12, 202, 23-24 (B 210, 25-26)

puruṣādhiṣṭhitaṃ bhāvaṃ prakṛtiḥ sūyate sadā /
hetuyuktam ataḥ sarvam jagat saṃparivartate //
dīpād anye yathā dīpāḥ pravartante sahasraśaḥ /

Note the parallelism *puruṣādhiṣṭhitā buddhiḥ* in our text. Incidentally an explication of the well-known term *svabhāva* for *prakṛti* presents itself: "its OWN *bhāva*" as opposed to its three evolved ones. In the sequel of 202 the doctrine of the eight *prakṛtis* follows, but after a series where taste is a product (*guṇa*) of water (*soma*!), smell of earth etc., *manas* of *sattva, sattva* is born from *prakṛti* and the possessor of *buddhi* (*buddhimān*) is recognized as the *sarva-bhūtātma-bhūtastha* (cf. Gītā 5, 7; 6, 29/31), *bhāva* returns (34): all these *bhāvas* carry the whole universe, they derive (*śritāḥ*) from the God beyond *rajas* (*virajasam*), whom they call "the highest point" (*paramaṃ padam*). In the next adhyāya, 204 (B 211), the *bhāvas* are described as *svabhāvahetujāḥ* (st. 3) and *avyaktajāḥ*, which are synonyms:

tadvad avyaktajā bhāvāḥ kartuḥ kāraṇalakṣaṇaḥ /
acetanāś cetayituḥ kāraṇād abhisaṃhitaḥ (?) //4//

[8] For some post-epic evidence of the three *bhāvas*, cf. my paper in *Adyar Library Bulletin*, XIX, vol. 1-2 (Adyar, 1955).

'likewise the *bhāvas,* sprung from the *avyakta,* which are known as the causes (evolvents) (in the service) of the agent (= evolving *puruṣa*). Being non-conscient themselves they are conglomerated (?) (starting) from the evolvent conscient one.' In 12-13 it reads:

hetuyuktāḥ prakṛtayo vikṛtayaś ca parasparam /
anyonyam abhivartante puruṣādhiṣṭhitāḥ sadā //
sarajastāmasair bhāvaiś cyuto hetubalānvitaḥ /
kṣetrajñam evānuyāti pāṃsur vāterito yathā //

The stanzas are corrupt, but the meaning of 12 is clear enough, and 13 must mean something like: the fallen *kṣetrajña* is pursued by the *bhāvas rājasa* and *tāmasa,* like dust (⌒ *rajas*) which is raised by the wind. It is clear that the relation between the *bhāvas,* including *svabhāva,* and *puruṣa* is very intimate: they still derive from him. This view is still behind Gītā 7, 12-13:

ye caiva sāttvikā bhāvā rājasās tāmasāś ca ye /
matta eveti tān viddhi na tv ahaṃ teṣu te mayi //
tribhir guṇamayair bhāvair ebhiḥ sarvam idaṃ jagat /
mohitaṃ nābhijānāti mām ebhyaḥ param avyayam //

To sum up. We find in the older portions of the Mokṣadharma clear evidence that the "*guṇas*"[9] are indirectly responsible by their influence on a higher principle for the evolution of three *bhāvas* "forms of being or becoming (*bhū*), cosmic phases" which in one text which we have reconstituted correspond to *manas,* senses and elements. Almost invariably the relevant passages have suffered badly, a sure indication that already at an early date this function of the triad was no longer understood. It is not the place here to link our evidence up with the upaniṣadic triad of cosmic phases; this may be undertaken in a later study of the most versatile and mysterious *guṇa,* the *sattva.*

[9] That means: The triad in which *rajas* figures; *guṇa* as the specific term for this triad is relatively late. The question whether the two other evolutionary factors, viz. those behind the evolution of the *buddhi* into the *bhāva* names and into the *bhāva* elements, were indeed known by the terms *sattva* and *tamas* will be discussed in another study on *sattva.*

THE STABILIZATION OF THE TEXT OF THE HEBREW BIBLE, REVIEWED IN THE LIGHT OF THE BIBLICAL MATERIALS FROM THE JUDEAN DESERT *

MOSHE GREENBERG
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

THE REMARKABLE CACHES of ancient documents discovered in the Wilderness of Judah enable us for the first time to see what the text of the Hebrew Bible looked like at about the turn of the Era. What was formerly a matter largely of inference from early translations and the testimony of Rabbinic literature can now be controlled by manuscript evidence. The material is extensive, and will take years to publish; yet a sufficient amount has already been made available to make some tentative judgments possible, and, indeed, necessary. The following is an attempt to sketch the effect of the new material on our understanding of the old, and to outline some major stages in the formation of the received Hebrew text from the early Hellenistic period onward.

* A paper presented to the Oriental Club of Philadelphia. In the course of revision I had the benefit of discussing the major points with Professor Harry M. Orlinsky. Professor Orlinsky also made available to me his as yet unpublished contribution to the Irwin *Festschrift.* I wish to acknowledge here his courtesy and valuable criticism.

I

The text of the Hebrew Bible is made up of three historically distinct elements: in order of antiquity and stability they are the consonants, the vowel letters, and the system of diacritical marks for vowels and cantillation. The present system of diacritical marks was developed by the Massoretes—the preservers of the text tradition—of the Palestinian school at Tiberias in the 9th century. It is the product of two centuries of intensive text-critical work in the schools of Palestine and Baby-